

**FLORIDA** | Board of Podiatric Medicine

**DRAFT MINUTES**

March 27, 2015

SpringHill Suites by Marriott  
Orlando International Airport  
5828 Hazeltine National Drive  
Orlando, FL 32822



Chet Evans, DPM

***Chair***

Scott Koppel, DPM

***Vice-Chair***

Adrienne Rodgers, BSN, JD

***Interim Executive Director***

1 **General Board Business started: 9:00 a.m.**

- 2  
3 **I.** The meeting was called to order by Dr. Evans, Chair. Those present for all or part of the meeting included the following:

4  
5 **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

6 Chet Evans, DPM, Chair  
7 Mark S. Block, DPM  
8 Joseph Strickland, DPM  
9 Joseph Sindone, DPM  
10 Robert Morris, Ph.D.  
11 James Pearce, BBA, MBA

12 **STAFF PRESENT:**

13 Adrienne Rodgers, BSN, JD, Executive Director  
14 Joseph Lesho, Program Operations Administrator

15 **EXCUSED:**

16 Scott Koppel, DPM, Vice-Chair  
17 Excused by Dr. Evans, Chair

18 **BOARD COUNSEL:**

19 Mary Ellen Clark, Assistant Attorney General  
20 Office of Attorney General

21 **PROSECUTION COUNSEL:**

22 Yolanda Green, Assistant General Counsel  
23 Matthew Witters, Assistant General Counsel

24 **COURT REPORTER:**

25 For the Record  
26 (850) 222-5491

27  
28 *Please note the minutes reflect the actual order agenda items were discussed and may differ from the agenda outline. AUDIO from this meeting can be found online: <http://floridaspodiatricmedicine.gov/meeting-information/past-meetings>*

29  
30 **Section II began: 9:00 a.m.**

31  
32 **II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

33  
34 **a. February 3, 2015**

35 Minutes of the February 3, 2015 Full Board Meeting were reviewed.

36  
37 Dr. Evans noted that page 3, lines 11 and 37, refer to “Dr.” Pearce, and should be corrected to “Mr.” Pearce.

38  
39 Action: Motion to accept the minutes as amended was made by Dr. Morris. Seconded by Dr. Sindone.

40  
41 Vote: 6 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried

42  
43 **b. Correction to July 18, 2014 (lines 38, 41, and 46)**

44 Corrections to the minutes of the July 18, 2014 Full Board Meeting were reviewed.

45  
46 Action: Motion to accept the minutes as amended was made by Dr. Block. Seconded by Dr. Sindone.

47  
48 Vote: 6 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried

49  
50 **Section II concluded: 9:04 a.m.**

51 **Section III began: 9:04 a.m.**

52  
53 **III. FINAL ORDER ACTION:**

54  
55 **a. Nathan W. Moy – Determination of Waiver, Case No. 2013-13918**

56 The department requested that this case be withdrawn because the notice to respondent was not sent timely.

1 **b. Lonnie Brian Robinson – Hearing, No Disputed Material Facts, Case No. 2013-13393**

2 Dr. Block was recused due to participation on the probable cause panel.

3  
4 Dr. Robinson was present, and was represented by counsel, Benjamin Newman, Esq.

5  
6 An Amended Administrative Complaint filed by the Department charged Respondent with violation of section  
7 461.013(1)(x), F.S. (sic), for failing to report to the Board a plea of nolo contendere to Driving Under the Influence  
8 within 30 days after date Respondent entered the plea. Respondent was served by certified mail and initially requested a  
9 formal hearing, but subsequently elected a hearing with no disputed material facts at the request of his counsel.

10  
11 Motion that the Board accept into evidence the investigative file made by Dr. Sindone. Seconded by Dr. Strickland  
12 Vote: 5 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried

13  
14 Motion to find that Respondent filed an Election of Rights and requested an informal hearing with no issues of disputed  
15 material fact made by Dr. Sindone. Seconded by Dr. Strickland.  
16 Vote: 5 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried

17  
18 Motion to accept the findings of fact as stated in the Administrative Complaint was made by Dr. Sindone. Seconded by  
19 Dr. Strickland.  
20 Vote: 5 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried

21  
22 Mr. Newman provided information to the board regarding the DUI and subsequent treatment and probation, and said that  
23 his failure to report was due to lack of knowledge or understanding that he was required to do so. He emphasized that s.  
24 456.072, F.S., states that the board “may” impose discipline, and argued that it is discretionary, and that action in this  
25 case is not warranted. He told the Board that Dr. Robinson did everything required of him by the court timely, and  
26 without issue, and that there is no evidence of intent to conceal or deceive. He then requested that the Board close the  
27 case with no disciplinary action.

28  
29 Dr. Evans asked Dr. Robinson if he had any comments.

30  
31 Dr. Robinson stated that he regrets not informing the Board, and that he had no idea he had to.

32  
33 Motion to adopt the conclusions of law, as stated in the Administrative Complaint and find that this constitutes a  
34 violation of the Podiatric Practice Act made by Dr. Sindone. Seconded by Dr. Strickland.  
35 Vote: 5 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried

36  
37 Ms. Green then allowed Respondent’s counsel to make his arguments regarding the Board’s motion to adopt the  
38 conclusions of law.

39  
40 Mr. Newman requested that if the Board cannot dismiss the case or is compelled to impose discipline, that it be the  
41 absolute minimum.

42  
43 Ms. Green stated that the Department recommended dismissal of the case based on the fact that this was the first  
44 complaint filed against Dr. Robinson; he had no prior discipline in 18 years of practice; he took a laws and rules course,  
45 which addresses his lack of knowledge of the requirement to report the DUI; and he completed all of his probation  
46 requirements and was terminated from probation early.

47  
48 Ms. Clark noted that the disciplinary guideline, 64B18-14.002(1)(hh), does not have an intent or knowing component.  
49 She then read into record the terms of 64B18-14.003, F.A.C. – mitigating circumstances.

50  
51 Mr. Newman explained that he believed the behavior of Dr. Robinson fit several of the mitigating factors.

52  
53 Dr. Sindone asked what would happen with the costs to the Department if the Board voted to dismiss. Ms. Green stated  
54 that the Department withdrew its Motion to Assess Costs.

55  
56 Dr. Sindone then asked if those costs would be the responsibility of the state. Ms. Green explained that the costs were  
57 \$174, and that the state would bear the costs.  
58

In light of the mitigating circumstances of the case, Mr. Pearce made a motion to impose costs of \$174.96. Seconded by Dr. Sindone.

Vote: 5 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried

Mr. Newman asked if the case would be dismissed upon payment of the costs. Ms. Clark explained the Administrative Complaint was filed and a Final Order would be drafted, and that the imposition of costs would be considered discipline.

**c. Brian Keith Hameroff – Settlement Agreement: Case No. 2011-00493**

Dr. Block was recused due to participation on the probable cause panel.

Dr. Hameroff was present, and was represented by counsel, A.S. Weekley, Esq.

An Administrative Complaint filed by the Department charged Respondent with violation of sections 461.013(1)(l), F.S., and 461.013(1)(o), F.S., for failing to keep medical records justifying the course of treatment of the patient, and for prescribing controlled substances outside of the professional practice of podiatric medicine.

Ms. Green advised the board that the settlement agreement contained the following provisions:

- Reprimand
- Administrative fine in the amount of \$10,000 payable within 30 days from the date of the filing of the Final Order
- Probation effective the date of the filing of the Final Order for a period of 3 years under the indirect supervision of a Board-approved monitor
- Reimbursement of actual costs not to exceed \$4,846.97 payable within 30 days from the date of the filing of the Final Order
- Continuing Education: Laws and Rules Course, a Drug Course (sic), and a Records Course

**Discussion:**

Mr. Weekley stated that Dr. Hameroff has chosen to accept the Settlement Agreement. He also explained that Dr. Hameroff surrendered his DEA registration April 2011, and it has not been restored, and it is doubtful that it will be restored at any time in the foreseeable future.

Ms. Clark read into record the disciplinary guidelines stated in Rule 64B18-14.002(1)(m) and (1)(p), F.A.C. She also explained that before voting, the board must discuss the variable terms of the Settlement Agreement, such as monitor during the probationary period.

Dr. Evans stated that he would need to review a more comprehensive CV of the proposed monitor, and then he would communicate with the board office upon approval. He then asked Dr. Hameroff how he would deal with patients that require prescriptions for controlled substances while under probation. Dr. Hameroff explained that he has been practicing without a DEA license for 4 years, and if controlled substance prescriptions need to be written, his partner will see the patient and write the prescription, and the partner's name will be entered into the patient's record.

Motion to accept Settlement Agreement made by Dr. Strickland. Seconded by Dr. Sindone.

Vote: 5 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried

**Section III concluded: 9:44 a.m.**

**Section X began: 9:45 a.m.**

**X. COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

**d. Disciplinary Compliance**

**i. Neil A. Kravitz, D.P.M. – Motion for Hearing/Request to Vacate**

Dr. Kravitz was present, and was not represented by counsel.

Dr. Kravitz submitted a Motion for Hearing/Request to Vacate the Final Order filed July 9, 2013 in case number 2012-00767, which revoked his license to practice podiatric medicine in the state of Florida. He also requested a temporary license to practice in a limited capacity in accordance with s. 456.015, F.S.

**Discussion:**

Ms. Clark provided background information on the request and motion. She stated that the Board did not have jurisdiction to revisit the matter of the Final Order because more than 30 days had lapsed since it was filed. In regards to his request for a temporary license, she explained that s. 456. 015, F.S., is only available to professionals who have retired in good standing.

Dr. Kravitz made comments regarding his motion and explained reasons for the length of time before he attempted action.

Ms. Clark asked Board staff whether or not Dr. Kravitz had paid all fines related to previous Final Orders. Ms. Rodgers verified that he had.

Dr. Kravitz informed the Board that he has an open application for licensure, but he had not taken Part III of the National Examination because it did not exist when he was issued his initial license. Ms. Clark explained that the Board would need to review that application in order to make a decision to approve or deny it.

Ms. Clark recommended denial because 30 days had passed since the filing of the order.

Motion to deny the Motion for Hearing/Request to Vacate the Final Order made by Dr. Sindone. Seconded by Dr. Strickland.

Vote: 6 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried

Dr. Sindone suggested that Dr. Kravitz complete and submit his application, including taking the examination, so that the application can appear before the board and a decision can be made.

**Section X concluded: 10:09 a.m.**

**Section IV began: 10:09 a.m.**

**IV. PROSECUTION REPORT:**

Ms. Green stated that the Department currently has 31 cases pending, including 6 cases that were tabled due to a breach of the confidential call in number during the last PCP meeting, and two cases on the current agenda. Regarding Year-Old cases, one was on the current agenda, in addition to another 12 pending. The Department asked the Board to allow them to continue to continue prosecute the year-old cases.

Motion to allow prosecution of cases one year old and older made by Dr. Morris. Seconded by Dr. Sindone

Vote: 6 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried

The Board also discussed future PCP meetings, including deciding to hold the next meeting in-person on June 18, 2015.

**Section IV concluded: 10:18 a.m.**

**Section V began: 10:18 a.m.**

**V. APPLICANTS PRESENTED FOR BOARD REVIEW:**

**a. Podiatric Physician –**

**i. Patrick J. Nunan, D.P.M.**

Dr. Nunan was not present, and was not represented by counsel.

Dr. Nunan submitted an application for licensure as a Podiatric Physician. Upon review of the application and supporting documentation, Board staff discovered that the state of West Virginia had taken disciplinary action against the applicant's license due to his inability to produce documentation of completion of required coursework. The application was deemed complete on January 20, 2015. Based upon this information, the application and supporting documentation were presented before the board.

**Discussion:**

Dr. Block noted Dr. Nunan's absence and asked if he was requested to be present.

Ms. Clark explained that his attendance was requested, but not required.

Motion approve the application for licensure made by Dr. Sindone. Seconded by Dr. Morris.  
Vote: 6 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried

**ii. Nimesh M. Patel, D.P.M.**

Dr. Patel was present, and was represented by counsel, Allen Grossman, Esq.

Dr. Patel's application for licensure as a Podiatric Physician was originally presented before the board at the February 3, 2015 meeting. Dr. Patel requested that the issue be tabled until the March 2015 meeting due to his retention of new counsel.

Dr. Patel initially submitted his application for licensure in December 2014. Upon review of the application and supporting documentation, it was discovered that Dr. Patel held an existing license, which was denied renewal in April 2014. The application and additional supporting documentation were presented before the board for discussion.

**Discussion:**

Dr. Evans explained that Dr. Patel was in the process of fulfilling the terms of a Final Order issued at the March 2014 meeting when his license was denied renewal.

Ms. Clark stated that Dr. Patel received Notice of Non-Renewal from the Department in May 2014 due to being listed on the U.S. Department of Health & Human Services Office of Inspector General (OIG) exclusion list. She recommended that the Board address the terms of the March 2014 Final Order if they decide to approve the application.

Mr. Grossman said Dr. Patel was placed on the exclusion list for accepting inappropriate gifts from various individuals. He reiterated that Dr. Patel was in the process of complying with the Final Order before he was denied renewal. He requested that the Board consider that fact, as well as the fact that they felt his prior violation was not enough to prevent him from practicing, and asked that they approve his application.

Dr. Evans noted that his original license was issued in 2005. He said that approval of the application would require fulfillment of previous final order.

Dr. Sindone asked if the sanctions or restrictions imposed by the OIG were still ongoing. Mr. Grossman stated that there are three and a half years left of the OIG exclusion, and Dr. Patel would be unable to participate in Medicaid or Medicare during that period.

Dr. Morris asked Mr. Grossman to elaborate on the circumstances of Dr. Patel's OIG exclusion.

Mr. Grossman explained that there are federal regulations that prohibit gifts from providers of equipment and supplies, and told the Board that no harm was done to patients, and there was no overuse of medications or supplies. He said that over the course of two and a half years, \$8000 worth of gifts was given to him and staff.

After additional discussion, Dr. Evans asked for a motion.

Motion to approve the application for licensure with condition that he fulfill the terms of the March 2014 Final Order made by Dr. Sindone. Seconded by Dr. Morris.

Vote: 6 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried

**iii. John DeStefano, D.P.M.**

Dr. DeStefano was not present and not represented by counsel.

Dr. DeStefano's application for licensure as a Podiatric Physician was originally presented before the board at the February 3, 2015 meeting. At that meeting, the Board deferred consideration of the application to the March 2015 meeting and requested that the applicant provide evidence from the state of New York that all conditions of probation imposed by that state have been met. Such evidence was provided by Dr. DeStefano, and was presented before the Board for discussion.

**Discussion:**

Dr. Evans explained that the obligations were fulfilled, and asked if there was any discussion.

Dr. Sindone asked how the discipline from New York would appear on his license. Ms. Rodgers explained that the Florida license would reflect "Clear and Active." Dr. Evans clarified that the New York discipline would show during the credentialing process at hospitals and other entities.

Motion to approve the application for licensure made by Dr. Sindone. Seconded by Dr. Block

Vote: 6 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried

**iv. Nelson Hulbert, D.P.M.**

Dr. Hulbert was present, and was not represented by counsel. Dr. Penny Ziegler from PRN was also present on behalf of PRN.

Dr. Hulbert's application for licensure as a Podiatric Physician was originally presented before the board at the March 28, 2014 meeting. At that meeting, Dr. Hulbert waived the 90-day application requirement to allow time for a PRN evaluation. PRN requested that Dr. Hulbert enter a 6-week program, and then undergo a re-evaluation. The result of the re-evaluation was presented before the Board for discussion.

**Discussion:**

Dr. Hulbert made comments about his requirement through PRN.

Dr. Evans said that the letter from PRN states that Dr. Hulbert is in compliance, all requirements have been met, and they feel he is safe to practice. In addition, all application requirements and expectations have been met.

Dr. Zeigler reiterated what was written in the letter.

Dr. Strickland asked if PRN was continuing random drug tests. Dr. Zeigler stated yes.

Dr. Sindone asked Dr. Hulbert if he was continuing treatment or participating in support groups. Dr. Hulbert said that attends meetings, and intends to continue to do so.

Motion approve the application for licensure made by Mr. Pearce. Seconded by Dr. Morris.

Vote: 6 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried

**Section V concluded: 10:46 a.m.**

**Section VI began: 10:46 a.m.**

**VI. RATIFICATION OF LICENSURE:**

**a. Podiatric Physicians**

Motion to ratify Podiatric Physician license numbers 3695 through 3714 was made by Dr. Sindone. Seconded by Dr. Block.

Vote: 6 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried

**b. Podiatric Residents**

Motion to ratify Podiatric Resident license number 410 was made by Dr. Strickland. Seconded by Dr. Sindone.

Vote: 6 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried

**c. Podiatric X-Ray Assistants**

Motion to ratify Podiatric X-Ray Assistant license numbers 1699 through 1727 was made by Dr. Sindone. Seconded by Dr. Block.

Vote: 6 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried

1 **Section VI concluded: 10:49 a.m.**

2 **Section VII began: 10:49 a.m.**

3  
4 **VII. CHAIR/VICE CHAIR REPORT:**

5  
6 **a. Future Agenda Items: No report**

7  
8 **b. Extension Request:**

9  
10 **i. Jason Hancock, D.P.M.**

11 **ii. Nicole Hancock, D.P.M.**

12 Drs. Jason and Nicole Hancock were in attendance to fulfill the requirement to attend one full day of a  
13 Florida Board of Podiatric Medicine meeting at which disciplinary hearings are conducted within 24  
14 months of initial licensure, as required by Rule 64B18-17.005, F.A.C.; however, the doctors have exceeded  
15 the 24-month timeframe and are asking for an extension so that their attendance would be considered for  
16 fulfillment of the requirement.

17  
18 Ms. Clark advised Drs. Hancock that the board cannot officially rule until a petition has been submitted.

19  
20 Dr. Evans explained that they would not be required to appear, as long as their petition is in compliance.

21  
22 **Section VII concluded: 10:53 a.m.**

23 **Section X resumed: 10:53 a.m.**

24  
25 **X. COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

26  
27 **iii. Petition for Variance/Waiver:**

28  
29 **1. Lauren Karger, D.P.M.**

30 Dr. Karger submitted a petition for variance/waiver of Rule 64B18-17.005, F.A.C., to allow an  
31 extended period of time to complete the requirement to attend one full day of a Florida Board of  
32 Podiatric Medicine meeting at which disciplinary hearings are conducted within 24 months of  
33 initial licensure.

34  
35 **Discussion:**

36 Dr. Evans explained that Dr. Karger submitted her petition in the event that the March 2015  
37 meeting would not be a live meeting. As of the date of the meeting, she was still within the 24-  
38 month period, and since the meeting was indeed live, he asked if she would like to withdraw her  
39 petition.

40  
41 Dr. Karger agreed to withdraw the petition.

42  
43 Motion accept withdrawal of petition was made by Dr. Sindone. Seconded by Dr. Strickland.

44 Vote: 6 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried

45  
46 **Section X concluded: 10:55 a.m.**

47 **Section VIII began: 10:55 a.m.**

48  
49 **VIII. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT:**

50  
51 **a. Discussion – Contract with NBPME**

52 Mr. Lesho presented the contract between the Department of Health and the National Board of Podiatric Medical  
53 Examiners, Inc. (NBPME), outlining the terms of administration and utilization of the national examination for podiatric  
54 licensure. He explained that the contract expires June 30, 2016, and that if the Board does not wish to see any changes  
55 made to the terms of the agreement, then the Department will renew the contract as-is, but if the Board does wish to  
56 make changes, then that information will be relayed to the Department's Contract Management Unit.

57 Dr. Evans asked if Board staff knew of any issues that would require changes. Mr. Lesho stated that he was not aware of  
58 any.



The Board had no requested changes.

**Section VIII concluded: 10:57 a.m.**

**Section IX began: 10:57 a.m.**

## **IX. BOARD COUNSEL'S REPORT:**

### **a. Rules Status/Rules Report**

Ms. Clark informed the board that the changes to Rule 64B18-16.002, F.A.C., took effect October 27, 2014.

### **b. Draft Language for New Rule 64B18-24.002, F.A.C. and Application for Podiatric Medicine X-Ray Assistant Training Course and Examination**

Ms. Clark explained that she drafted Rule 64B18-24.002, F.A.C., and worked with Board staff to create the new application form to accompany it.

Dr. Evans explained that the Florida Podiatric Medical Association (FPMA) is only the provider currently in effect.

Mr. Pearce asked is Ms. Clark was happy with end product, or if there was anything else that she felt should be included.

Dr. Sindone asked if the providers could be charged by the Board for approval. Ms. Clark said she would check the statutes for allowable fees.

Dr. Sindone asked how a passing score would be determined. Ms. Clark stated that according to s. 461.0135, F.S., the passing score is determined by the training authority.

Ms. Clark then explained that the board's rule regarding fees is Rule 64B18-12, F.A.C., which does not specify a fee for this issue. The fee authority is found in s. 461.05, F.S., and s. 456.025(7), F.S. The latter allows for a fee to be charged not to exceed \$250. She explained that in order to implement the fee, Rule 64B18-12, F.A.C., would need to be amended.

Dr. Evans explained that the Board could approve the form as-is, and then revisit it at a later date if changes need to be made.

Motion to approve the Application for Podiatric Medicine X-Ray Assistant Training Course and Examination form was made by Dr. Block. Seconded by Dr. Strickland.

Vote: 6 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried

Motion to approve the development of Rule 64B18-24.002, F.A.C., made by Dr. Morris. Seconded by Dr. Block.

Vote: 6 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried

Ms. Clark asked the Board if a Statement of Estimated Regulatory Costs would be needed to implement this rule. She asked if the proposed rule would have an adverse impact on small business or be likely to increase regulatory costs by \$200,000 in the aggregate in the state of Florida within 1 year after implementation.

Motion that the proposed rule would not have an adverse impact on small business or be likely to increase regulatory costs by \$200,000 in the aggregate in the state of Florida within 1 year after implementation made by Dr. Morris.

Seconded by Dr. Sindone.

Vote: 6 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried

### **c. North Carolina State Board of Dental Examiners v. FTC**

#### **i. Response from FARB**

Ms. Clark explained the outcome of North Carolina State Board of Dental Examiners v. FTC and its potential impact on the Board, and also presented the written response by the Federation of Associations of Regulatory Boards.

#### **Discussion:**

Ms. Clark explained that this board and the North Carolina Board of Dental Examiners have a difference in the make-up of the board because their members are not appointed by their governor as they are in Florida. She said the North Carolina board did not have the authority to issue a cease & desist, but the Florida boards do. She requested that future New Board Member Training should include an explanation of this case.

Dr. Block asked which board would take precedence if, while in the process of defining the scope of practice for a profession, there is an overlap with a profession of another board. Ms. Clark said that in general, s. 456.011(5), F.A.C., allows joint board meetings in the event of differences between boards.

**Section IX concluded: 11:33 a.m.**

**Section X resumed: 11:33 a.m.**

## **X. COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

### **a. Budget – Robert Morris, Ph.D.**

Ms. Rodgers explained that the most current budget information could be found in the 2013-2014 annual report, and that more information will be given at the next meeting after the end of the current quarter.

Dr. Morris had nothing to report.

### **b. Continuing Education – Scott Koppel, D.P.M.**

#### **i. CE Providers and Courses Approved by Board Staff**

Motion to ratify CE Providers and Courses Approved by Board Staff was made by Dr. Sindone. Seconded by Dr. Morris

Vote: 6 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried

#### **ii. CE Providers and Courses Approved by Committee Chair**

Motion to ratify CE Providers and Courses Approved by Committee Chair was made by Dr. Sindone. Seconded by Dr. Strickland

Vote: 6 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried

### **c. Credentials – Scott Koppel, D.P.M.**

Nothing to report.

### **e. Examination – Chet Evans, D.P.M.**

Nothing to report, but reiterated that the Department will be renewing the contract with NBPME.

### **f. Healthy Weight – Chet Evans, D.P.M.**

#### **i. Talking with Patients About Weight Loss; Tips for Primary Care Providers**

#### **ii. Choose MyPlate**

#### **iii. Move Our State to Its Healthiest Weight**

### **g. Legislative – Scott Koppel, D.P.M.**

Nothing to report.

### **h. Probable Cause – Mark Block, D.P.M. –**

Dr. Block's report was given in conjunction with the Prosecution Report.

#### **i. Stats**

### **i. Residency Programs**

Dr. Evans asked if everyone was in compliance. Ms. Rodgers explained that everyone was in compliance for the prior year, but there is still time for programs to comply for the current year.

### **j. Rules – Chet Evans, D.P.M.**

1 Nothing to report.

2  
3 **k. Unlicensed Activity – Robert Morris, Ph.D.**

4 Nothing to report.

5  
6 In light of the departure of Melvin Price, D.P.M. from the Board, Dr. Evans appointed Dr. Strickland to chair the Disciplinary  
7 Compliance committee, and Dr. Sindone to chair the Residency Program committee.

8  
9 **Section X concluded: 11:43 a.m.**

10 **Section XI began: 11:43 a.m.**

11  
12 **XI. NEXT MEETING – July 10, 2015**

13 Mr. Lesho stated that the Board will no longer meeting on July 10, 2015, and that the next meeting will take place on  
14 June 19, 2015, preferable in Orlando. The Board also discussed future meeting dates, and decided that meetings will also  
15 be held on August 7, 2015 and October 23, 2015. Dates and times will be determined by Board staff.

16  
17 **Section XI concluded: 11:49 a.m.**

18 **Section XII began: 11:49 a.m.**

19  
20 **XII. ADJOURNMENT**

21 Motion to adjourn the meeting made by Dr. Sindone. Seconded by Dr. Strickland.

22 Vote: 6 yeas / 0 opposed; motion carried

23  
24 **The meeting was adjourned at 11:50 a.m.**